



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,538	12/27/2001	Sang Wook Kim	P-0316	9448

34610 7590 01/09/2006

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/026,538	Applicant(s) KIM ET AL.	
	Examiner Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed December 27, 2001.
2. Claims 1-15 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

3. The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed December 27, 2001.

Priority

4. The priority date considered for this application is December 28, 2000.

Drawings

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).
 - a. The drawings, e.g., FIG. 4, must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the feature **local memory** (as required in the storing step of Claim 2) must be shown (e.g., in block 30) or the feature canceled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.
 - b. FIG. 6: Step S14: it is suggested that “of the database” be inserted after “in the local memory”.
 - c. FIG. 6: in Step S15, it is unclear as to the meaning of “one row data are all collected?” Should the inquiry be – Are all data in a row collected? –
 - d. FIG. 6: in steps S16 and S17, it is suggested that – DYNAMIC – be inserted before “STORING SPACE – to be consistent with FIG. 4, block 30. Correction is required.

Specification

6. The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the following minor informalities.
- a. the Abstract contains a typographical error at line 7: “are” should read – area –.
 - b. the following changes to line 5 are suggested to clearly point out the subject matter of the invention: – local memory of the database. The generic method then creates a dynamic storage area in the database for the data based on the –

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
8. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- Claims 2 (line 2) and 10 (line 6) recite the limitation “storing the detected data in a local memory. It is unclear as to the exact location of the local memory, e.g., is the local memory in the client, server or database? The specification of the location of this local memory will render the scope of the claim more ascertainable for art rejection purposes.
- Claims 2 (line 3) and 10 (line 7) recite the limitation “generating and expanding storing space in a memory area of the server.” The recitation of the expanding storing space in a memory area of the server appears to be inconsistent with the

illustration of the same feature, e.g., expanding storing space, in FIG. 4, which shows that the dynamic storing space (interpreted to be equivalent to the claimed expanding storing space) is in the database. Furthermore, the specification does not explicitly disclose whether the database is part of the server or part of another server.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

10. Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art (APA) of pages 1-7 of applicants' background and Background Art FIGs. 1-3.

Claim 1

APA discloses at least:

calling a generic method in a server (see at least Background Art FIG. 3, step S2 and related text; it should be noted that step S2 is similar to step S12 in FIG. 6 which is representative of the present invention; a statement closest to an explicit definition of the claimed *generic method* is found in [37], lines 1-2 or step S13 of FIG. 6; it should be noted that this definition is similar to that of the method of the prior art described in [12], lines 1-2 or S3 of Background Art

FIG. 3; therefore, the *generic method* is equated to the method of the prior art since the claim language *generic method* is not deemed sufficient to distinguish the claimed method over that of the prior art);

detecting data by the called generic method and storing the data (see at least Background Art FIG. 3, steps S3-S4 and related text;); and

returning the detected data to a client, in the distributed processing system (see at least Background Art FIG. 3, step S6 and related text).

Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA further discloses *wherein storing the detected data comprises:*

storing the detected data in a local memory (see at least Background Art FIG. 1, block 30 and related text; since the location of claimed *local memory* is not explicitly defined, for art rejection purposes, the local memory is interpreted to be located in the database illustrated in the Background Art FIG. 1);

generating and expanding storing space in a memory area of the server according to a form and a number of the detected data (see at least Background Art FIG. 3, step S4 and related text); and

copying the detected data from the local memory to the storing space (see at least Background Art FIG. 3, step S5 and related text).

Claim 3

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 2 are incorporated. APA further discloses *wherein the generation and expansion of the storing space are accomplished through a sequence type declarative function* (see at least [16], Step B).

Claim 7

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA further discloses *wherein the server has one generic method* (a statement closest to an explicit definition of the claimed *generic method* is found in [37], lines 1-2 or step S13 of FIG. 6; it should be noted that this definition is similar to that of the method of the prior art described in [12], lines 1-2 or S3 of Background Art FIG. 3; therefore, the *generic method* is equated to the method of the prior art since the claim language *generic method* is not deemed sufficient to distinguish the claimed method over that of the prior art).

Claim 8

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. APA further discloses *wherein the generic method is called by a generic data structure comprising a Structure Query Language (SQL) string parameter and a pointer parameter* (see at least Background Art FIG. 2 and related text; e.g., “short methodX(in string SQLstring, out returndataX RetVal)” where X is A or B or C).

Claim 10

Since Claim 10 recites the same limitations of Claims 1 and 2, the same rationales set forth in the rejection of Claims 1 and 2 are deemed applicable to Claim 10.

Claim 12

Since Claim 12 recites a feature that is similar to that of Claim 3, the same rationale set forth in the rejection of Claim 3 is deemed applicable to Claim 12.

Claim 14

Since Claim 14 recites a feature that is similar to that of Claim 7, the same rationale set forth in the rejection of Claim 7 is deemed applicable to Claim 14.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA.

Claim 5

APA does not specifically disclose *wherein the copying of the detected data is performed on data units of rows*. However, Official notice is taken that the detected data copying to be performed on data units of rows is well known in the art of relational database because it is well known that records are stored in rows (one record – one row) of tables in relational database and that users can specify in a SQL query form which record or parts of a record to retrieve from the database. It is also well known that the retrieved data, i.e., data in a row can be saved to any files and subsequently stored in any storage medium (e.g., *copying of the detected data ...*). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

the above well known technique to copy data in a row of a table of a database for the purpose of facilitating database management in a CORBA environment.

13. Claims 4, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of A Discussion of the Object Management Architecture, January 1997 ([DisOMA97]).

Claim 4

APA does not specifically disclose *wherein a data form of the generated storing space is declared as any type*. However, [DisOMA97] discloses different basic data types, one of which is basic type “any” (see at least 3.2.4) used in a request form according to the requirements of OMG IDL for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of client’s request to a server in CORBA platform.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the same basic type “any” as taught by the OMG in the client request described in APA for the purpose discussed above.

Claim 6

APA does not specifically disclose *wherein the storing space is automatically generated by any type and sequence type declaratives within a data structure used to call the generic method*. However, [DisOMA97] discloses different basic and constructed data types, among which are basic “any” and constructed “sequence” types (see at least 3.2.4) used in a request form according to the requirements of OMG IDL for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of client’s request to a server in CORBA platform.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the same basic type “any” and constructed type

“sequence” as taught by the OMG in the client request described in APA for the purpose discussed above.

Claim 9

Rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 8 are incorporated. APA does not specifically disclose *wherein the generic data structure is defined by declarative functions of any type and sequence type*. However, [DisOMA97] discloses different basic and constructed data types, among which are basic “any” and constructed “sequence” types (see at least 3.2.4) used in a request form according to the requirements of OMG IDL for the purpose of facilitating the transmission of client’s request to a server in CORBA platform.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the same basic type “any” and constructed type “sequence” as taught by the OMG in the client request described in APA for the purpose discussed above.

Claim 11

Since Claim 11 recites a feature that is similar to that of Claim 4, the same rationale set forth in the rejection of Claim 4 is deemed applicable to Claim 11.

Claim 13

Since Claim 13 recites a feature that is similar to that of Claim 5, the same rationale set forth in the rejection of Claim 5 is deemed applicable to Claim 13.

Claim 15

Since Claim 15 recites a feature that is similar to that of Claim 6, the same rationale set forth in the rejection of Claim 6 is deemed applicable to Claim 15.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu "Antony" Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The Examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday – Friday from 7:15 to 17:45.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached at (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



ANTONY NGUYEN-BA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 31, 2005